

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 354 554

CS 508 055

AUTHOR Droge, David; Roundy, Jack
TITLE Meeting the Needs of At-Risk College Freshmen through Academic Advising: The "Enriched" Public Speaking Course.
PUB DATE Oct 92
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (78th, Chicago, IL, October 29-November 1, 1992).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Advising; *College Freshmen; *Course Content; Course Descriptions; Higher Education; *High Risk Students; *Introductory Courses; *Public Speaking
IDENTIFIERS Advisor Role; *University of Puget Sound WA

ABSTRACT

A program was developed at the University of Puget Sound (Washington) to meet the needs of students "at-risk" for poor academic performance or attrition because of inadequate pre-college preparation. Advising sections (small--15 or 20 students--sections of regularly-offered courses, whose instructor serves as the student's academic advisor until a major is chosen) of entry-level speaking and writing courses are offered as an "enriched" program. Their unique elements include such things as attention to learning styles, assignments which focus on argumentative discourse, and intensive advising. Classes mix "at-risk" students with other students and thus are not stigmatized as "remedial." The performance of students from these classes shows higher retention and lower academic probation rates than their classmates in general, and GPAs which compare favorably. Several features of public speaking instruction can be helpful for "at-risk" students, developing ability in argumentative discourse, legitimizing students' ideas and experiences, and offering them speech instructors with particular interpersonal skills and attitudes as advisors. Experience with this program indicates that such success requires university-wide, rather than discipline-specific, commitment. Further, it is important to distinguish between advising and recruiting for majors. Also, effective general education teaching and effective scholarship may not be compatible. Finally, the issue of "diversity" needs to be approached with care and forethought. (Two appendixes contain resources for enhanced freshman advising sections, and a class syllabus.) (SR)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED354554

**MEETING THE NEEDS OF AT-RISK COLLEGE FRESHMEN THROUGH
ACADEMIC ADVISING: THE "ENRICHED" PUBLIC SPEAKING COURSE**

by
David Droge and Jack Roundy

University of Puget Sound
Tacoma, Washington

Presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication
Association, Chicago, Illinois, October, 1992

David Droge is Associate Professor of Communication and Theatre Arts.

Jack Roundy is Director of the Academic and Career Advising Services
Center.

University of Puget Sound
1500 N. Warner Street
Tacoma, WA 98416

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

David Droge

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

[] Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

AS 508055

Meeting the needs of at-risk college freshmen through academic advising: The "enriched" public speaking course

Anxiety over the nation's educational system is a major contemporary political and social theme. Colleges and universities encounter a particularly threatening set of circumstances. The entry-age population (17 to 19 year olds) is dwindling in number. More importantly, at the same time as technological progress has increased the level of literacy and sophistication in symbol manipulation required of the workforce, the proportion of entering students who have received inadequate preparation for college is increasing. Additionally, the ethnic distribution of entering cohorts of college freshmen shift each year; soon no ethnic majority will dominate college campuses. Several recent analyses of public education (e.g., Jonathan Kozol's *Savage Inequalities*) contend that "underpreparation" for college is still largely a function of economically-based racial discrimination in education. Hence colleges and universities not only face dwindling numbers of potential freshman, but the "pool" contains larger and larger numbers of students whose basic education has inadequately prepared them for the rigors of college at a time when the college degree is rapidly becoming the universal entry-level credential for employment.

This strain to produce more literate graduates from a shrinking and increasingly underprepared pool is particularly acute for small, private, tuition-driven colleges and universities. Competition for well-prepared students, particularly for students of color with good pre-college preparation, has resulted in a series of highly-publicized "bidding wars" in which colleges offer attractive financial aid packages in hopes of

attracting the "better" students (as measured by college entrance examinations). In the interest of preparing students for an increasingly multicultural society, institutions also have targeted financial aid funds for students of color to try to increase the ethnic diversity of their own campuses. Unfortunately, this attention at the "front end" of the college experience frequently is the only concerted effort institutions of higher education extend to students in "special circumstances" who are otherwise underprepared, e.g., those admitted under special considerations including a particular athletic or artistic talent, a student whose family has strong ties to the institution, or a "diversity" or "minority" admission. These students are "at-risk" of leaving college before completing their degrees. For example, a study reported recently by the Associated Press in our local newspaper concludes that historically black colleges, while admitting only 16% of all African-American students entering college, graduated 45% of all African-American graduates. This year the NCAA, concerned over the possible exploitation of student athletes in major college programs, instituted rules requiring individual colleges to publicly report the proportion of athletes who graduated as contrasted with the institution's overall graduation rate.

Our purpose here is not to denigrate the efforts of colleges and universities to attend to the need for a well-educated, ethnically diverse citizenry; those efforts deserve our praise and support. Our aim is rather to argue that this group of students, who are linked only by lower-than-average scores on college entrance examinations, bring to college a variety of life experiences, economic circumstances, time demands, and intellectual strengths which call for individualized academic support,

rather than highly-visible "special" classes which can serve to isolate them from the rest of the college community.

We will focus on a program developed at our own university to meet the needs of students "at-risk" for poor academic performance or attrition because of inadequate pre-college preparation. After describing the inception and current status of this program, we will contend that academic advising is an appropriate arena for providing special assistance to at-risk college freshmen, rather than special curricular offerings. We will further claim that basic public speaking courses, as well as rhetorically-grounded freshman composition courses, are advantageous for "at-risk" students because those courses help students develop familiarity with academic discourse. We will conclude with a series of observations and provocations for college teaching based on our experience with this program.

THE ENRICHED ADVISING PROGRAM

At our institution academic advising is primarily a faculty responsibility. Currently only three staff members (two professional and one clerical support) are dedicated to the advising function; their activities largely complement faculty advisors by, for example, offering advisor training, preparing and revising annually an advising manual for faculty advisors, facilitating intake and advisor placement for new students, assisting in appropriate referrals, and "crisis" counseling. Each of our 2800 undergraduates has an academic advisor, usually in his or her major field of study. Each entering freshman student, however, is invited to select up to four potential "advising sections" from among 50 courses,

most of which meet the University's "Core" requirements. The student is then assigned to an advising class, a small (15 to 20 students) section of a regularly-offered course. The course instructor serves as the student's academic advisor until a major is chosen, usually during the student's second year. The freshman advisor will continue as academic advisor to those students who choose to major in the advisor's discipline. A variety of courses in almost every discipline have been taught as advising sections; some students may select a course pertaining to a prospective major, but undecided students frequently are placed in entry-level communication skills (freshman composition and public speaking) courses.

The "enriched" program was offered as a pilot in 1989 by a faculty volunteer. This individual (first author) proposed to teach an advising section of a basic public speaking course which would include a number of students selected because they were at risk for academic difficulty and attrition. This course offering, which was developed in collaboration with the Director of Academic and Career Advising (second author) included the following unique or "enriched" elements:

1. **An added text.** All students read, discussed, and prepared a "Speech of Inquiry" based on Neil Postman's *Amusing Ourselves to Death*, a "trade" book which presents his argument that public discourse has been perverted into entertainment by electronic media. This book was included to develop students' acuity in dealing with provocative written arguments as a follow-up to the University's "Prelude" program, a two-day "Writing and Thinking" experience for all freshmen offered during Orientation Week.

2. Administration of a Learning Styles Inventory. These commercially prepared self-assessment instruments are designed to prod individuals into contemplating their own learning strengths and weaknesses. Consistently, most college students and especially low-scoring entering freshmen have preferences for learning which are incongruent with the abstract and passive mode of information transmission characterizing lectures. Our Learning Center staff have developed a series of strategies appropriate for each of the four styles identified in the current Silver and Hanson LSI instrument (see Appendix One). Our purpose in administering this instrument was to get students actively engaged in reflecting on their own learning preferences and developing strategies to deal with academic tasks incongruent with their strengths.

3. Assignments which focussed on argumentative discourse. Of the students' major speaking assignments, only one was informative. The remaining assignments required students to establish a claim of definition, present "both sides" in a speech of inquiry, and make a case for a policy change. The goal of this component was to increase students' familiarity with the structure and evaluation of arguments; concern for delivery skills was frankly minimized in this course in favor of a concentration on arguments and analysis.

4. "Intensive" advising. Where appropriate, students were encouraged to carry a lighter academic load first semester, to utilize propaedeutic courses offered by the Learning Center, or to make use of a Career Awareness course if they seemed unable to envision a post-graduation life for themselves. In some cases individual

faculty were recommended because of their reputation as either particularly helpful or particularly challenging. This segment of the program represented the only concession to the students' "at-risk" status. In every case, however, final choice of schedule was the student's.

Two key elements of student placement were agreed upon by the faculty member and the Advising Director. First, the composition was to be "mixed;" that is, the course was not to be composed entirely of "at-risk" students. Second, the pilot was not to be widely promoted. This decision was made to protect the students involved from being stigmatized as enrolled in a "remedial" class. Much of the advising activity, in fact, was based on the advisor's experiences with previous students; no special requests were made of other faculty or of student support services.

Twenty students enrolled in this advising section in September 1989. As measured by our most reliable predictor, this group of students was "at-risk." Our University generates a composite "score" for each entering freshman based on the formula

$$(\text{Composite Score} = \text{HS GPA} \times 200 + \text{SAT Verbal} + \text{SAT Math})$$

The mean composite for the Fall 1989 entering freshman class was 1786; this advising section had a mean score of 1592, almost 200 points lower. Seven of the twenty students in this course came from the bottom 10% of the entering class; past performance indicated that this group was more than three times as likely to be placed on academic probation at the end of the first term as other members of the entering class. Five additional

students' scores were barely above the lowest group; only three of the students in this section had composite scores above the class mean.

At the end of the first semester, two students (10%) in this class were on academic probation; although this proportion was higher than that for the class as a whole (4.1%), the Advising Director estimated that the predictive measures would indicate that 20% of this group could have been in academic difficulty. The mean GPA for the group was a 2.81, slightly below the 2.93 average for the class as a whole. One of these students made the Dean's list. Needless to say, the performance of this group was encouraging.

Currently 16 of the 20 students who were in this group are still enrolled in the University; this 80% retention figure is actually greater than the overall retention rate of 73% of the freshmen who enrolled in the fall of 1989. The average GPA for this group is 2.84, compared with a 3.07 for the class as a whole. No one else in the group has ever been placed on academic probation.

The success of this pilot program led to the development of a multi-section "Enriched" Freshman Advising program in the Fall of 1991. Three or four faculty members each year participate in the program, which mixes at-risk students with others primarily in entry-level speaking and writing courses; "enriching" activities are made available to faculty and supported by the Academic and Career Advising Center. These enrichments are either incorporated into the course or offered as outside sessions (See Appendix One). Additionally, a faculty member who joined the University after 1989 has been offering instruction in "Mind Mapping" (see Michael Gelb, *Present Yourself!* for a sample public speaking text) as an alternative

to outlining for students whose learning styles do not coincide with traditional strategies for organizing speeches or essays.

We continue to be encouraged by the performance of the 1991 cohort. 19 of the 54 students in these sections were in the bottom 10% of their freshman class by composite score. At the end of the Fall semester only two (3.6%) were on academic probation. All students in these sections were still attending the University. Their success was primarily responsible for their freshman class having the second lowest proportion of students on probation (5.3%) on record at the University.

PUBLIC SPEAKING AND "AT-RISK" STUDENTS

The measurable success of this "enriched" program highlights features of public speaking instruction which can be particularly helpful for "at-risk" students. First, we note that rhetorically-grounded public speaking courses help students develop abilities which have been found useful in other courses which make use of argumentative discourse. Current freshmen enter college following a life-long immersion in a mass-mediated popular culture; their ability to develop and analyze a sustained chain of reasoning may be a casualty of that cultural immersion. To the extent that public speaking develops students' ability to analyze texts and situations argumentatively, these courses help all students learn to speak the common language of the academy, the language of argument.

Second, we contend that public speaking courses can legitimize the ideas and experiences of students and help them develop a "voice" in the academic community. Unlike many other college courses, assignments in public speaking generally have enough flexibility so that students can find

topics that interest them, that they care about passionately, or that resonate with their experiences. Structural and research requirements frequently lead to refinement or modification of a student's original idea or position as the student develops a speech. The structure of speech classes ensures that student work will receive a public hearing and, in many cases, challenging questions and/or comments. Students learn from one another's performance as well as from textbooks and lectures. Each student also is cast in the role of advocate for a position, usually regarding a topic which has more than one legitimate point of view.

This ability to identify one position as "stronger" in a world of competing points of view has been described by some education theorists as the mark of a liberally-educated person (see, for example, William Perry's *Intellectual and Ethical Development in the College Years*). This ability also will serve students well in their scholarly writing throughout their academic careers. Perhaps most importantly, this concentration in public speaking courses conveys to students the belief that their ideas and experiences are legitimate, and that those ideas can be "translated" into the discourse of particular disciplines through an increasingly refined application of rhetorical principles introduced in a public speaking course. Ultimately, public speaking may be a course which teaches students how to speak the language of the University.

Finally, we would argue that speech communication instructors are likely to have developed particular interpersonal skills and attitudes which can be particularly advantageous in this form of academic advising. Coursework in interpersonal communication exposes speech communication professionals to active listening skills and the importance of developing empathy in any relationship. In addition, speech communication is an

inherently interdisciplinary field. Our teaching and research are informed by scholarship from a variety of fields. Hence speech instructors may have strengths which can make them particularly appropriate academic advisors in an institution-wide strategy of faculty advising.

OBSERVATIONS AND PROVOCATIONS

We have described one university's attempt to meet the needs of "at-risk" students through a minor modification of an existing Freshman Advising program. We have also identified features of basic public speaking courses and instructors which seem to fit well with such a program. We will conclude by offering a series of observations on higher education which come from our experiences with these students.

First, we are convinced that general education courses can be successful only if an institution is willing to commit its best teachers to those courses and develop them as university-wide, rather than discipline-specific, in focus. Too often senior faculty retain the privilege of "opting out" of survey or required undergraduate courses. Our students report, however, that an inexperienced or ineffective instructor can not only make a student's academic experience more difficult, but that instructor also can dissuade a student from ever considering coursework in a particular area again. Commitment to general education from experienced and talented teachers will become more and more valuable as student populations become increasingly diverse and increasingly subject to an inadequate public education system.

Second, we believe it is important to distinguish between advising and recruiting. Many faculty indicate that they can be effective advisors

once students have chosen a major. We suggest that such advising may be less important than advising which helps students select a field of study appropriate for their interests, talents, and aspirations. In a recently-completed survey of our own students the most frequently reported complaint was that advisors were too active in trying to convince students to major in their own fields. Most faculty members are advocates for their own field of study; after all, interest in a field must be fairly strong to sustain graduate students through the ordeal of earning a terminal degree. The problem for advising is that a University-wide system delivered by individual faculty may not necessarily get students the best information to help them make wise decisions regarding a major field of study. Individual advisors need to know how to direct students to student service resources (e.g., Career Advising Services) to help them make appropriate choices.

Third, effective general education teaching and effective scholarship may not be compatible. Liberal arts colleges have attempted to differentiate themselves from other post-secondary educational institutions by suggesting that "narrow vocational" training was less valuable than a solid grounding in the habits of mind that characterize a good liberal arts education. The difficulty here is that the professoriat, grounded in the strict disciplinary focus that characterizes graduate education, may end up advocating a "vocational training" program of their own--one that leads students to become scholars. Although we would not denigrate scholarship, we would suggest that the goal of liberal education is to produce effective leaders or responsible citizens; disciplinary scholarship is not necessarily the best method of preparation for citizenship or effective workplace participation. Hence we believe that successful faculty members struggle continually with the tensions

between the creation of new knowledge represented by scholarship and the valuable insights a particular field has to offer the general student who may encounter that field only one time in his or her college career.

Finally, we contend that our experience teaches us that the issue of "diversity" needs to be approached with care and forethought. Our University held a four-hour forum after the Los Angeles riots in May of 1992. At that forum several students from minority groups asserted that part of their difficulty was that they were treated as spokespersons for their "people." Sometimes, said one student, she didn't have time to talk to students interested in learning "what it was like to be a person of color;" instead, she needed to study for a math test or write a paper for a political science class. Efforts to increase diversity can have the unanticipated effect of continuing to "marginalize" the experiences of people of color by assuming that their only place in the University community is to represent their culture. Such an attitude is not only destructive, it is uninformed; rather than a "colonial" model which views students of color as representatives of an alien, self-contained, ahistoric "other culture;" a healthy approach to multiculturalism is grounded in the metaphor of the immigrant. All students are vulnerable to "culture shock" as they enter a culture with unfamiliar rules and a different language. Diversity is ultimately a dialectical exchange between the traditional values of the academy and the ideas, interests, and experiences of succeeding waves of people from a different culture--the culture of American youth. As our students come from an increasing variety of cultural backgrounds and a disappointingly inadequate pre-college preparation system, resolution of this dialectic between the university culture and their experiences and interests is one of the most important and exciting challenges facing

higher education. Speech communication professionals, historically treated as "second-class" academics in many universities, have an opportunity to take positions of institutional leadership as colleges face this challenge.

RESOURCES FOR ENHANCED FRESHMAN ADVISING SECTIONS

• • • ATTITUDE • • •

SELF ASSESSMENT TOOLS:

**LASSI - Interest Inventories -
Learning Style Indicators and Inventories -
Academic Motivation**

LASSI: Learning and Study Strategies Inventory

The LASSI is designed to assess the student's use of learning and study strategies. There are ten areas addressed: Attitude, Motivation, Time Management, Anxiety, Concentration, Information Processing, Selecting Main Ideas, Study Aids, Self Testing, and Test Strategies. The tool is both diagnostic and prescriptive in design.

The LASSI takes approximately 15-20 minutes to take. An additional 10 minutes is needed for scoring. Sharlyn Russell, Center for Writing and Learning, is an excellent resource for this instrument.

Interest Inventories:

Strong Campbell - Self Directed Search - Sigi Plus

Strong Campbell Interest Inventory (SCII)

The Strong Campbell Interest Inventory was developed by E.K Strong Jr. Published in 1927, the SCII has the longest history of any psychological test. It is one of the most thoroughly researched and highly respected instruments in use today. It compares a person's interests with the interests of people happily employed in a wide variety of occupations. When a person's interests are similar to the interests of the people in the sampling, some general predictions can be made about what careers seem most compatible with that person's career interests. The profile can also help a person to organize interests into patterns (e.g., types of environments and people with whom he/she is comfortable). It measures interests not aptitude or intelligence, and it is used best as a tool to assist individuals in making curricular or occupational choices.

The Strong Campbell takes approximately 30 to 40 minutes to take. The inventory is sent away to be scored. Generally scoring time is 7 to 10 days. A group interpretation can be done in 30 to 40 minutes. Dianna Kunce and Janet Maddock, Academic and Career Advising, are contact persons for the use of this tool.

Exercises:

1. The SCII is based on a theory of six personality types (Realistic, Investigative, Artistic, Social, Enterprising, Conventional). Each of us have interests and skills for each of the six types, however, one or two will be predominant. Give a definition of your dominant personality preferences and explain how this is useful to you in assessing your career direction. (Refer to profile remarks on the back side of the profile and the *Self-Directed Search* handout).
2. Using the information gathered from your scores on the SCII, discuss what you think would be a good work environment for you. What types of work activity seem best suited to you? (Refer to the *Self-Directed Search* handout).
3. The information from the SCII can help you with choice of major. How can it help you? If you haven't already decided on a major, has the SCII helped you clarify your interest? Explain.
4. Do you have a preference for working with data/ideas, people, or things? You might enjoy working with two or even three. Explain your preference and give an example. To find your preference, refer to the SCII Introversion/Extroversion scale.
5. Have student take the SCII. (A career counselor would be happy to do a group interpretation.) Ask students to identify an occupation/career field of interest; research and write a paper on that particular career, including a discussion of types of tasks performed, skills required, working environment, outlook, etc.
6. Identify basic interest areas and write an essay about the beginnings of this interest, development of the interest, and applications of interest in collegiate and work worlds.

Self Directed Search (SDS)

Designed by John Holland, SDS is based on his theory of personality types. The theory explains the interaction of personality types with characteristics of environments. This instrument is a self-administered, self-scored, and self-interpreted career counseling tool. It is most effective with individuals who are self-motivated and self-directed in their career search. Many clients prefer the SDS because it is self-scoring and they can get immediate results. The following steps are recommended for those who use the Self Directed Search:

- 1) Using the Self-Assessment Booklet, a person
 - lists occupational aspirations
 - indicates preferred activities in the six areas
 - reports competencies in the six areas
 - indicates occupational preferences in the six areas
 - rates abilities in the six areas
 - scores the responses he/she has given and calculates six summary scores
 - obtains a three-letter code from the three highest summary scores

2) Using the Occupational Finder, a person locates from among the 1,156 occupations those with codes that resemble his/her summary code.

3) The person compares the code for his/her current vocational aspiration with the summary code to determine the degree of agreement.

4) The person is encouraged to take some "Next Steps" to enhance the quality of his/her vocational decision-making.

The Self Directed Search can be taken and self interpreted in 45 minutes. Dianna Kunce and Janet Maddock, ACA, could be a resource in using this instrument.

Exercises:

1. Use questions 1, 2, 4 and 5 from SCII

SIGI PLUS

SIGI (pronounced "siggy") is an acronym for System for Interactive Guidance and Information. Individuals who use this computer assisted career guidance program can explore a number of career interest areas and find helpful information for academic and career planning.

This career decision making tool emphasizes personal values (what satisfactions individuals want from their work), and offers a planning strategy. It contains current occupational information which is updated annually. There are nine separate but interrelated sections. Individuals will have different goals so they may find certain sections of SIGI to be more useful than others. We encourage first-time users to go through the entire program so they cover all major aspects of their career decision process. The following are the nine different sections in SIGI PLUS that one can choose from:

1. Introduction - What's in SIGI PLUS
2. Self-Assessment - What do I want? What am I good at?
3. Search - What occupations might I like?
4. Information - What can I learn about various occupations?
5. Skills - Can I do what's required in the area of skills?
6. Preparing - Can I do what's required academically?
7. Coping - Can I find the time and money, etc. that I need?
8. Deciding - What's right for me?
9. Next Steps - How do I put my plan into action?

The SIGI-Plus is a 3 hour program from start to finish. Students may sign up for one hour slots in the Office of Academic and Career Advising.

• • • SOCIAL INTEGRATION • • •

Enhancing awareness of University organizations

Exercises:

1. PAA's could be of help here. They could give 10-minute presentations in class regarding campus organizations and activities; will host pizza party at pre-registration time with instructor.
2. Invite key people from University resources to speak in class: counseling center, Center for Writing and Learning, Community Volunteer Center, etc.
3. Assign students to individually visit CVC, identify a volunteer "job" of interest to them and write about it. Could do this in a group (over there) with Jacki Droge assisting.

Social event tied closely with an academic
experience

Theatre event - The Office of Academic and Career Advising is willing to offer some financial assistance for such an event.

Exercises:

1. There are four different types of values that influence career choice: life, cultural, personal and work values. In SIGI you sorted your work values. List your work values by order of importance. Which was most important to you and why? What did you learn about yourself when you prioritized your values.
2. In SIGI you identified your strongest skills. What were they and give examples of accomplishments in which you used those skills.
3. Discuss what you learned about yourself and your career direction as a result of using SIGI.
4. Students spend time (on their own) with the computer. Write a paper on their values (personal and work) as identified in using SIGI, and relate them to academic preparation for life/career.

Learning Style Instruments:

Myers Briggs Type Indicator - Learning Style
Inventory
(Silver & Hanson) - Learning Style Inventory (Kolb)

Myers Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI)

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, based on C. G. Jung's theory of psychological types, is used to understand patterns in behavior. The essence of the theory is that the behavior of people can be orderly and consistent depending on the different ways they prefer to use their perception and judgment. If people differ systematically in what they perceive and how they reach conclusions, then they will differ in their reactions, interests, values, motivations, skills, and interests.

The MBTI is useful in career decision making for helping individuals understand their interests and how they want to live their lives. They learn about their preferred functions and attitudes in order to identify work settings and tasks that are compatible with their preferences. When there is a mismatch between the person and his or her occupation the person usually loses interest and is dissatisfied. Tasks that allow individuals to use their preferences usually require less effort and give more satisfaction and better performance. Isabel Myers developed the following work expectations for each preference:

Extroverts: Work interactively with a succession of people, or with activity outside the office or away from the desk.

Introverts: Work that permits some solitude and time for concentration

Sensing types: Work that requires attention to details and careful observation.

Intuitive types: Work that provides a succession of new problems to be solved.

Thinking types: Work that requires logical order, especially with ideas, numbers, or physical objects.

Feeling types: Work that provides service to people and a harmonious and appreciative work environment.

Judging types: Work that imposes a need for system and order.

Perceptive types: Work that requires adapting to changing situations, or where understanding situations is more important than managing them.

Myers Briggs takes approximately 40 to 50 minutes to take. It too is sent away and takes 7 to 10 days to process. A general interpretation can be down in 30 to 40 minutes. Dianna Kunce, ACA, does general and individual interpretations.

Exercises:

1. The MBTI is useful in helping you to understand your interests and how you may wish to live your life. What is your MBTI type? (Example: ISFJ). What insights have you gained about yourself that were particularly interesting to you?
2. Explain how understanding your type can be helpful to you as you think about your career direction.
3. The Sensing and Intuitive scale and the Thinking and Feeling scale are the scales which offer information about career choice. What have you learned about expectations for work from these two scales? In other words, what are the best work situations for you based on your preferences for these two scales?

Learning Style Inventory (LSI)

The LSI developed by H. Silver and R. Hanson is also based on C. Jung's theory of psychological types (1921). This learning style oriented form of the Myers Briggs instrument focuses on how an individual prefers to collect information "sensing" and "intuiting" and makes judgements "thinking" and "feeling". Four distinct learning profiles result:

1. Sensing and Thinking (S-T)
Characteristics: practical, logical, results-oriented
2. Intuiting and Thinking (N-T)
Characteristics: intellectually-curious, theoretical
3. Sensing and Feeling (S-F)
Characteristics: interpersonally oriented, impulsive
4. Intuiting and Feeling (N-F)
Characteristics: curious, creative, independent

Sharlyn Russell in the Center for Writing and Learning uses this inventory to access how an individual approaches learning and how they learn best. Your dominant class style's orientation can be helpful information when determining modes of delivery of information and assignments. The test can be taken, scored, and interpreted generally in one hour.

Learning-Style Inventory (LSI)

The Learning Style Inventory is based on Kolb's Experiential Learning Theory. Kolb views learning as a four stage cycle: concrete experience, observations and reflections, formation of abstract concepts and generalizations, and testing implications of concepts in new situations. A learner's style is his or her reliance on a particular mode in the learning cycle. There are four style types based on the individual's tendency along the two basic dimensions of abstract/concrete and action/reflection. Kolb relates these styles to learning environment preferences. They are:

Converger (abstract conceptualization and active experimentation) The learner's greatest strength is in the practical application of ideas. The environment of choice for this style is the physical sciences, in particular, engineers.

Diverger (concrete experience and reflective observation) The learner's greatest strength is in the area of creative problem solving. The environment of choice for this style is the humanities and liberal arts.

Assimilator (abstract conceptualization and reflective observation) The learner's greatest strength is in their ability to create theoretical models. The environment of choice for this style is in the maths and sciences

Accommodator (concrete experience and active experimentation) The learner's greatest strength is in doing, enjoys new experiences, an intuitive problem solver. The environment of choice for this style is technical or practical majors i.e. business.

The LSI can be taken and interpreted within a class session. Users of the LSI include Ron Albertson, Sharlyn Russell, and Frank Hruza.

Exercises:

Some possible ideas taken from Internship 497's use of the LSI (Kolb) are:

1. The experiential learning model lends itself nicely to autobiographical journals followed by active experimentation.
2. Reading biographies or autobiographies of famous individuals i.e. Einstein and relating Kolb's experiential learning model.

Academic Motivation

Both Sharlyn Russell, Center for Writing and Learning, and Judith Jaynes, Counseling Center, can give excellent lectures on the subject of academic motivation.

Point of interest: Judith Jaynes recently published Eager to Learn, a book that examines academic motivation and children.

*** ACADEMIC INTEGRATION ***

Study Strategies:
Note-taking - Time Management - How to Read

Sharlyn Russell is an excellent resource for the above. Research supports the study and application of study strategies within an academic context, i.e. humanities, as being most beneficial.

Informational Interviewing:
Faculty - Alumni

Informational interviewing. Interview either a faculty person or alumni (one or more-either/or) in a discipline/career about which they are interested or want to know more. Write a report on the interview.

Give a brief explanation about why you chose to interview this person. How did you locate this person? Give name, title, place of work. Give a brief summary of the information you gathered which is most helpful to you in your academic/career planning. How does this information help you? If it does not help you, why? Was there anything that you would do differently in making the contact and/or in conducting the interview? What would you do differently?

Computer Familiarization

There are student consultants available in both computer labs: Howarth 215 and McIntyre 215. These students are able to individually assist students needing computer familiarization.

Library Tour

A physical tour of the library can be experienced by checking out an Audio walking Tour (28000) at the check out counter of the library.

Lori Ricigliano is responsible for library instruction. She is available to help classes address a particular assignment.

CTA 101D
MTThF 9:00-9:50 p.m.
Jones 213
Fall 1992

DAVID DROGE
Jones 300a
756-3333
Hours: MWF 11-12
and by
appointment

Objectives:

The *purpose* of this course is to introduce you to the field of *rhetoric* by developing your *critical* abilities and *public speaking* skills. To achieve this purpose, we will focus on improving your ability to:

1. *select and narrow a topic for presentation in a particular speaking situation to a particular audience;*
2. *formulate a communicative purpose appropriate for a given audience, topic, and situation;*
3. *analyze issues and audience expectations, values, and assumptions regarding a topic;*
4. *formulate and identify clear theses and claims;*
5. *conduct advanced library and interview research, resulting in thorough background information and in-depth analysis on a topic;*
6. *critically evaluate types of reasoning, forms of evidence, and logical merits of arguments;*
7. *outline material clearly and logically, including proper coordination, subordination, and parallelism;*
8. *employ stylistic devices, strategic organization, and appropriate language when presenting complex messages;*
9. *maintain poise when delivering presentations extemporaneously before an audience; and*
10. *listen carefully to and critically analyze the rhetorical messages of others.*

In addition, we will think, discuss, and prepare speeches about one of the major issues confronting our field in contemporary American society:

HAS THE PERVASIVENESS OF ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION
MEDIA, PARTICULARLY TELEVISION, MADE RHETORIC
OBSOLETE?

TEXTS:

The Speaker's Handbook (Third Edition)
by Jo Sprague and Douglas Stuart (S & S in schedule)

Present Yourself
by Tony Gelb (G)

Amusing Ourselves to Death
by Neil Postman (P)

You should also purchase a good quality T-120 videotape cassette
(no Memorex, please).

ASSIGNMENTS AND GRADING:

We will use a point system in this class. **1200 points are possible**. Don't fret, however; no one will earn 1200 points. Four types of assignments will occur. Examinations will assess your knowledge of readings and lecture materials. Small and larger speaking assignments will give you the opportunity to develop your public speaking ability. Critical papers will ask you to apply formal criteria in assessing the quality of speeches you hear. the assignments are:

Examinations-- We will have two in-class examinations over texts and lectures on Monday, October 5, and Wednesday, November 24. Each examination has a maximum score of **100 possible points**.

Speeches-- You will prepare and present **three** major speeches. The assignments are:

Argumentative Speech (5-7 minutes)	100 points
"On the other hand" Speech (7-9 minutes)	150 points
Policy Proposal (7-10 minutes)	150 points

Guidelines for each speech will be distributed well in advance, and we will discuss the objectives for each speaking assignment in class.

Critical Essays-- You will prepare four essays in which you critically analyze your own or someone else's speaking. The assignments are:

Inauguration Reaction	25 points
Self-critique (Argumentative Speech)	50 points
Classroom colleague critique (On the other hand speech)	50 points
Outside Speaker Critique (Due Dec. 17)	100 points

Short speaking assignments and class participation--because speaking occurs before an audience, it is important for you to attend this class. We will be taking attendance, and anyone missing more than 6 class sessions can expect a 50 point penalty.

In addition, we will have a series of short assignments designed to increase your level of comfort with speaking before your colleagues and to boost your point total. For any assignment which has a point value of 30 or fewer, simply completing the activity will get you the maximum number of points. These activities are:

My wonderful classmate	30 points
My birthday	40 points
A difficult idea	75 points
The Great Conversation	70 points
Previews (4 @ 15 points)	60 points
Editorial Mondays	100 points
I--15 points	
II--20 points	
III--20 points	
IV--20 points	
V--25 points	